

**What is the purpose of MRL and our Candidate Survey?**

Missouri Right to Life (MRL) supports the protection of all innocent human life, from the earliest embryo until natural death. MRL promotes the life ethic through education, legislation, and political action. Questions contained in the survey reflect the priorities of MRL and pro-life Missouri voters.

Missouri is among the states with the highest pro-life advantage in exit polling. At least one out of every seven Missouri voters will, as a first priority, choose the candidate most closely identified with the goals of MRL and pro-life sentiments. The MRL-PAC survey is the most thorough pro-life survey distributed to candidates, thereby most accurately assessing candidate positions for our members.

**What will MRL do with the survey results?**

Results will be reviewed and compared to public statements, campaign publications, voting records, other survey results, or personal communications between MRL personnel and candidates. MRL will publish our Summer and Fall newsletters with candidate ratings. These newsletters are mailed to MRL members and other interested pro-lifers and are published online at missourilife.org. The newsletters are also distributed in lit drops throughout Missouri as well as through fair booths and other local events. These distributions reach a minimum of 250,000 pro-life voters.

The MRL-PAC issues endorsements by mail notification. MRL-PAC may rescind or deny endorsement to any candidate. Candidates will not necessarily be notified ahead of time if endorsement is publicly rescinded due to a conflict between MRL-PAC survey answers and any other stated candidate positions. Candidates should not consider survey answers to be private.

**What if I have a question about a survey topic before I answer it?**

MRL strongly encourages any candidate with questions to call our state office at 573-635-5110. We know that not all candidates share an equal depth of knowledge about life issues, and we respect the desire to learn more. We would rather a candidate call than to leave a question blank.

**What if an incumbent does not complete an MRL-PAC Candidate Survey?**

Candidates, including incumbents, choosing not to respond to the MRL-PAC survey will be listed as such in our election cycle newsletter and online. It is worth noting that pro-life voters usually consider non-responsive candidates as having either an antagonistic view of their concerns or a lack of interest in their priorities. Candidates that publicly support either pro-abortion or pro-cloning organizations or efforts cannot be considered for MRL-PAC endorsement.

**Thank You for providing the Pro-Life public with your responses!**  
**Please complete the following reference information for your campaign:**

NAME: William Truman (Bill) Wayne PHONE: 660-747-5728

CAMPAIGN MAILING ADDRESS: 431 SE County Rd Y  
Warrensburg, mo 64093

WEBPAGE / EMAIL: www.oddtrum.net/121dist/libertyoddtrum.net

ALTERNATE CAMPAIGN CONTACT: \_\_\_\_\_  
PHONE OR EMAIL: \_\_\_\_\_

OFFICE SOUGHT: State Representative DISTRICT NUMBER: 121

**PLEASE RETURN SURVEY TO MRL BY : MAY 17, 2006**

Abortion advocates are pressuring states and health care professionals to distribute abortion-causing drugs. This is evident in the debate over the so-called "morning after pill", which has the chemical ability to cause the death of a new human embryo. These drugs are often referred to as "emergency contraception", although they can end life AFTER conception has occurred.

Despite objections from medical professionals, employers, and trade groups, some officials are forcing pharmacists and others to violate their own ethical views on abortion by requiring them to prescribe abortion-causing drugs.

6. Would you **VOTE FOR** legislation protecting health-care professionals who refuse to prescribe or dispense drugs that cause abortion, suicide, or other destruction of life from discrimination or legal liability (a.k.a. "Conscience Clause")?

YES *depending on exact wording*  NO

Human cloning is currently legal in Missouri, although no scientist has yet successfully claimed to have performed human cloning. The most common cloning technique in animals is "Somatic Cell Nuclear Transfer" or SCNT. Some researchers plan to use SCNT to clone human beings in order to harvest Embryonic Stem Cells (ESC's).

Harvesting embryonic stem cells destroys a living human being.

7. I would **VOTE FOR** legislation to **PROHIBIT**:

- A) all human cloning, both reproductive and therapeutic, including the method known as Somatic Cell Nuclear Transfer, or SCNT.
- B) allowing a cloned embryo to be implanted into a woman's womb to grow beyond the embryonic stage of development (reproductive cloning).
- C) allowing a cloned embryo to be grown in an artificial womb beyond the embryonic stage of development (also reproductive cloning).
- D) none of the above.

Please comment on your answer to question 7: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

8. I would **VOTE FOR** legislation to **PROHIBIT** abortion and human cloning (SCNT) despite political party platforms or loyalty to leadership/caucus.

YES

NO

**PLEASE CIRCLE THE ANSWER (letter, "yes" or "no", etc.) most accurately reflecting your position. Please use provided space or a separate sheet for additional comments. Thank you for your participation.**

**Abortion is legal throughout pregnancy due to U.S. Supreme Court rulings. It is possible in coming years to see a reversal of these permissive court decisions.**

**If Roe versus Wade is reversed, abortion laws most likely will be determined by state legislatures, state courts, or by voter initiatives or referendum.**

1. I would **VOTE FOR** legislation to **PROHIBIT** abortion:

- A) under all circumstances.
- B) except to save the mother's life.
- C) except in cases of rape or incest.
- D) none of the above.

2. Would you **VOTE FOR** legislation requiring abortion providers to inform patients of scientific evidence that unborn children experience pain during abortion?

YES

NO

3. Would you **VOTE FOR** legislation prohibiting any entity that promotes abortion from sponsoring, conducting, or otherwise participating in a sex-education program in Missouri public elementary or secondary schools?

YES

NO

**Planned Parenthood, America's largest abortion business, has criticized the lack of state funding for "family planning" appropriations. In the past, hundreds of thousands of tax dollars have been distributed to Planned Parenthood clinics in Missouri, which indirectly subsidized the abortion industry in Missouri. The 1980's statute that tried to protect taxpayers from supporting agencies that refer or promote abortions is still enjoined by federal courts, but a 1991 U.S. Supreme Court decision would allow a better-worded statute to be effective.**

4. Would you **VOTE FOR** legislation that **PROHIBITS** state funding of agencies or organizations that perform, promote, or refer women for abortions that are not a medical emergency?

YES

NO

5. Would you **VOTE AGAINST** state ratification of the federal Equal Rights Amendment, the wording of which, when used in state constitutions, has been interpreted by some state courts to require governmental funding of abortion?

YES

NO

9. Do you support or oppose the ballot initiative to amend the Missouri Constitution, the so-called Missouri Stem Cell Research and Cures Initiative, being proposed by the Missouri Coalition for Lifesaving Cures (see attachment)? Please circle your response below:

I SUPPORT THE AMENDMENT

*Depends on actual content of amendment*

I OPPOSE THE AMENDMENT AND WILL SPEAK AGAINST IT PUBLICLY

There is great debate over using government funds for research on human embryos, whether obtained from cloning or in-vitro fertilization. In 2001, President Bush halted federal funding of research that requires destruction of human embryos. Funding for research that advances adult stem cell therapies is not limited by the Bush policy.

10. Would you VOTE FOR legislation that PROHIBITS state funding of agencies, organizations, universities or research labs that promote, encourage or accommodate human cloning (SCNT) or destructive research on living human embryos or fetuses?

*Uncertain*  YES  NO  
*I oppose STATE BECAUSE Funding of research is not a single issue*  
*I would not deny ALL state funds based on a single issue*

The Terri Schindler-Schiavo case highlighted the confusing maze of laws concerning euthanasia and the ethics of withholding food and water from disabled patients. Health care professionals, ethics boards and facilities have loose guidelines to follow in many cases where laws are not specific. If an incapacitated person has no recorded documentation of his or her wishes, he or she may be subject to involuntary starvation and dehydration.

11. Would you VOTE AGAINST legislation allowing a health care provider to purposely assist in, or hasten, the death of a patient?

YES  NO  *Depends on patient's documented wishes.*

12. Would you VOTE AGAINST legislation allowing a health care provider to remove or withhold ordinary means of sustaining life (food, water, sanitary care) without a patient's specific prior written directive (consent)?

YES *Probably*  NO

If you desire to comment on any questions, please do so on a separate sheet and enclose it with the survey. Don't forget to reference each comment by indicating which survey question you are addressing. Thank you.

Candidate Signature *[Signature]* Date *4/26/06*

PLEASE RETURN SURVEY TO MRL BY: MAY 17, 2006